

Date: Sun, 14 Feb 93 04:30:20 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #38  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Sun, 14 Feb 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    38

Today's Topics:

FCC proposal on receivers/scanners including cellular  
Legal fund?? Re: Vero Beach Stop Transmitting Order  
The no-code issue (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 93 17:08:46 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: FCC proposal on receivers/scanners including cellular  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I thought I posted this item to this newsgroup, but having seen not  
one follow-up, I think I may have missed doing so. I suggest all  
hams examine the FCC proposed rules carefully for possible impact  
on ham equipment...especially 900MHz transverters which could  
possibly be used as is or with minor modification to receive cellular  
frequencies in the 800MHz range.

Date: Thu, 11 Feb 1993 05:10:24 GMT  
-----NOTICE-----

This information is provided as a public service by the:

Internet Federal Register Project of Counterpoint Publishing  
and The Internet Company (internet.com).

For more information on the availability of this data, please send mail to:

fedreg-info@internet.com

Redistribution of this information is unlimited as long as this notice is included and not modified in any fashion.

-----

47 CFR Parts 2 and 15

[ET Docket No. 93-1; FCC 93-1]

Radio Scanners That Receive Cellular Telephone Transmissions

AGENCY: Federal Communications Commission.

ACTION: Proposed rule.

SUMMARY: This Notice of Proposed Rule Making proposes to deny equipment authorization to radio scanners capable of receiving transmissions in the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service. This action is taken in response to the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act (Pub. L. 102-556). The intended effect of this action is to help ensure the privacy of cellular telephone conversations.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before February 22, 1993, and reply comments on or before March 8, 1993.

ADDRESSES: Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20554.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David Wilson, Office of Engineering and Technology, (202) 653-8138.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This is a summary of the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rule Making in ET Docket No. 93-1, FCC 93- 1, adopted January 4, 1993, and released January 13, 1993. The full text of this decision is available for inspection and copying during normal business hours in the FCC Dockets Branch (room 230), 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC. The complete text of this decision also may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Downtown Copy Center, at (202) 659-8657 or 1990 M Street, NW., suite 640, Washington, DC 20036.

Paperwork Reduction

The following collection of information contained in this proposed rule has been submitted to the Office of Management and Budget for review under section 3504(h) of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3504(h)). Copies of this submission may be purchased from the Commission's duplicating contractor, Downtown Copy Center, at (202) 659-8657 or 1990 M Street, NW., suite 640, Washington, DC 20036. Persons wishing to comment on this collection of information should direct their comments to Mr. Jonas Neihardt, Office of Management and Budget, room 3235 NEOB, Washington, DC 20554, (202) 395-4814. A copy of any comments filed with the Office of Management and Budget should also be sent to the following address at the Federal Communications Commission: Federal Communications Commission, Office of the Managing Director, Paperwork Reduction Project, Washington, DC 20554. For further information contact Ms. Judy Boley, (202) 632-7513.

OMB Number: None.

Title: Scanning Receiver Compliance Exhibit.

Respondents: Businesses or other for profit, small businesses/organizations

Action: New collection.

Frequency of Response: On occasion reporting.

Estimated Annual Burden:

Number of respondents: 40.

Annual hours per respondent: 0.25.

Total annual burden: 10.

Needs and Uses: An exhibit accompanying a Form 731 Application for Equipment Authorization will determine compliance of applicants requesting authorization to market scanning receivers and frequency converters with Congressionally mandated regulations. The regulations prohibit the marketing of radio scanners capable of intercepting, or being modified to intercept, cellular telephone conversations.

#### Summary of the Notice of Proposed Rule Making:

1. By this action, the Commission proposes to amend 47 CFR parts 2 and 15 to prohibit the manufacture or importation of radio scanners capable of receiving frequencies allocated to the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service. This action is in response to the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act (Act), Pub. L. 102-556.

2. The Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service ("Cellular Radio Service") provides telephone service to mobile customers. Cellular telephones use frequencies in the bands 824-849 MHz and 869-894 MHz to connect their users to other cellular system users and to the Public Switched Telephone Network.

3. As defined in 47 CFR part 15 scanning receivers, or "scanners," are radio receivers that automatically switch between four or more frequencies anywhere within the 30-960 MHz band. In order to control their potential to cause harmful interference to authorized radio communications, the rules require that scanners receive an equipment authorization (certification) from the Commission prior to marketing.

4. In the past five years, 22 different models of scanning receivers capable of receiving cellular telephone transmissions have been issued grants of equipment authorization. During this same period, ten other models capable of tuning frequencies between 806 and 900 MHz except for the cellular bands have also been authorized. Several publications currently on the market describe relatively simple modifications that users can make to many of the latter scanning receivers to enable that equipment to receive cellular telephone transmissions.

5. The Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act requires that the Commission, by April 26, 1993, prescribe and make effective regulations denying equipment authorization for any scanning receiver capable of:

- Receiving transmissions in the frequencies allocated to the domestic cellular radio service,

- Readily being altered by the user to receive transmissions in such frequencies, or

- Being equipped with decoders that convert digital cellular transmissions to analog voice audio.

The Act also stipulates that, beginning one year after the effective date of the regulations adopted to satisfy the above requirements, no receiver having the above capabilities shall be manufactured in the United States or imported for use in the United States.

6. In accordance with the Act, we are proposing to deny equipment authorization to scanning receivers that tune frequencies used by cellular telephones. We are also proposing to require applicants for the authorization of scanning receivers to include in their applications a statement declaring that their receivers cannot be tuned to receive cellular telephone transmissions.

7. Also in accordance with the Act, we are proposing to require that scanning receivers be incapable of being readily altered by the user to operate within the cellular bands. To assist us in determining whether a scanner complies with this requirement, we propose to require applicants for scanning receiver equipment authorization to include in their applications a statement pledging that their receivers cannot be readily altered to receive cellular telephone

transmissions. We also propose to prohibit the authorization of any scanning receiver for which cellular coverage can be readily restored by the user. We solicit comment on this proposed reporting requirement and on the definition of "readily altered." We also seek comment on whether additional information, such as why the receiver cannot be readily altered, should be required.

8. In further compliance with the Act, we propose to deny equipment authorization to any scanning receiver that can be equipped with decoders that convert digital cellular transmissions to analog voice audio. We invite comment on the potential impact of this requirement on existing models of scanning receivers.

9. There currently are a number of frequency converters on the market that can be used in conjunction with scanners that receive frequencies below 800 MHz to enable the reception of cellular telephone transmissions. We are proposing to deny equipment authorization to converters that tune, or can be readily altered by the user to tune, cellular telephone frequencies. We will require that applicants for FCC equipment authorization of frequency converters used with scanners include in their applications a statement pledging that the converters cannot be easily altered to enable a scanner to receive cellular transmissions. We seek comment on whether this statement should also include evidence indicating why the converter cannot be easily modified.

10. The Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis is contained in the text of the Notice.

#### 11. Comment Dates

Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in 47 CFR 1.415 and 1.419, interested parties may file comments on or before February 22, 1993, and reply comments on or before March 8, 1993. In order to comply with the requirement of the Telephone Disclosure and Dispute Resolution Act that FCC rules be promulgated within 180 days of enactment, we will proceed with this Notice without furnishing a prior text as provided by Article 607 of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Implementation Act of 1988 (Pub. L. 100-499, 102 Stat. 1851). To do so would frustrate achievement of a legitimate domestic objective. In addition, the Commission is not likely to be able to accommodate requests for extension of the comment periods. To file formally in this proceeding, you must file an original and five copies of all comments, reply comments, and supporting comments. If you want each Commissioner to receive a copy of your comments, you must file an original plus nine copies. You should send comments and reply comments to Office of the Secretary, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, DC 20554. Comments and reply comments will be available

for public inspection during normal business hours in the Dockets Reference Room of the Federal Communications Commission, 1919 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20554.

## 12. Ex-Parte Rules-Non-Restricted Proceeding

This is a non-restricted notice and comment rule making proceeding. Ex parte presentations are permitted, except during the Sunshine Agenda period, provided they are disclosed as provided in Commission rules. See generally 47 CFR 1.1202, 1.1203 and 1.1206(a).

13. For further information on this proceeding contact David Wilson, Technical Standards Branch, Office of Engineering and Technology, 202-653-8138.

List of Subjects in 47 CFR Parts 2 and 15:

Communications equipment, Wiretapping and electronic surveillance.

Federal Communications Commission.

Donna R. Searcy,  
Secretary.

Parts 2 and 15 of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations are proposed to be amended as follows:

### PART 2-FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS AND RADIO TREATY MATTERS; GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

1. The authority citation for part 2 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 4, 302, 303 and 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154, 154(i), 302, 303, 303(r) and 307.

2. Section 2.975 is amended by adding a new paragraph (a)(8) to read as follows:

2.975 Application for notification.

(a) \* \* \*

(8) Applications for the notification of receivers contained in frequency converters used with scanning receivers shall be accompanied by an exhibit indicating compliance with the provisions of 15.121 of this chapter.

\* \* \* \* \*

3. Section 2.1033 is amended by adding a new paragraph (b)(12) to read as follows:

2.1033 Application for certification.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \*

(12) Applications for the certification of scanning receivers under part 15 shall be accompanied by an exhibit indicating compliance with the provisions of 15.122 of this chapter.

\* \* \* \* \*

## PART 15-RADIO FREQUENCY DEVICES

1. The authority citation for part 15 continues to read as follows:

Authority: Secs. 4, 302, 303 and 307 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, 47 U.S.C. 154, 302, 303 and 307.

2. Section 15.37 is amended by adding a last sentence to paragraph (b), and adding a new paragraph (f), to read as follows:

15.37 Transition provisions for compliance with the rules.

\* \* \* \* \*

(b) \* \* \* In addition, receivers are subject to the provisions in paragraph (f) of this section.

\* \* \* \* \*

(f) The manufacture or importation of scanning receivers, and frequency converters used with scanning receivers, that do not comply with the provisions of 15.121 shall cease on or before April 26, 1994. Effective April 26, 1993, the Commission will not accept applications for equipment authorization for receivers that do not comply with the provisions of 15.121. This paragraph does not prohibit the sale or use of authorized receivers manufactured in the United States, or imported into the United States, prior to April 26, 1994.

3. Section 15.121 is added to read as follows:

15.121 Scanning receivers and frequency converters used with scanning receivers.

Scanning receivers, and frequency converters used with scanning receivers, must be incapable of operating (tuning), or readily being altered by the user to operate, within the frequency bands allocated to the Domestic Public Cellular Radio Telecommunications Service. Receivers capable of "readily being altered by the user" include, but are not limited to, those for which the ability to receive transmissions in the restricted bands can be added by clipping the leads off, or installing, a diode, resistor and/or jumper wire; or

replacing a plug-in semiconductor chip. Scanning receivers, and frequency converters used with scanning receivers, must also be incapable of converting digital cellular transmissions to analog voice audio.

-----  
Date: Sat, 13 Feb 93 15:04:05 GMT  
From: pacbell.com!att-out!walter!porthos!dancer!whs70@ames.arpa  
Subject: Legal fund?? Re: Vero Beach Stop Transmitting Order  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Does anyone know if there is a legal defense fund established to which I and other hams can contribute for legal expenses of the case discussed below?

In article <9302121705.AA23840@ucsd.edu>  
William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:  
>Information from Milt Farber, WB4IFM. (MF@dllws.cca.cr.rockwell.com)  
>  
>February 11, 1993  
>  
> David K. and Sharon T. Brower, WA4NST and N4XLF respectively, of Vero  
>Beach, Florida, recently lost a two year legal battle over their 68 foot radio  
>tower and antennas. In the Final Judgment for the plaintiffs (seven  
>households), Judge Charles E. Smith of the 19th Judicial Circuit in and for  
>Indian River County, Florida, has found the radio transmissions to be a  
>noxious and offensive activity, the appearance of the tower and antenna an  
>annoyance and nuisance to the neighborhood, and quoting the Final Judgment,  
>"This large, tall (87-feet) tower and antenna sticks out like an eyesore to  
>this subdivision and neighborhood." Smith also broadly ruled that the tower  
>is a building that exceeds the two story limitation for buildings in the deed  
>restrictions and limitations of the subdivision. The deed restrictions are  
>silent about antenna support structures.  
>  
>Pending appeal, Smith has stayed his order to remove the radio tower and  
>antenna but has enjoined the Browsers from further radio transmissions from  
>their home! If the Browsers are not successful with the appeal, this case will  
>set a dangerous precedent for any Ham who has a neighbor that does not like  
>the appearance of his exterior antenna and alleges interference to home  
>electronic appliances. Like the Browsers, the Ham will be ordered by the court  
>to remove his tower and cease radio transmissions.

-----  
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 93 18:21:21 GMT  
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!



lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: The no-code issue  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <QB77DE00@mmmpc6> hlester@as.arizona.edu (Howard Lester) writes:  
>How many proponents of no-code, or of the reduction of the speed  
>requirements, are from people who "can't do it?" Or from people who know  
>people who can't [seem to, or are unwilling to] do it/learn it?

I don't know. I'm not one of the ones who can't do it.

>Asking, or demanding a change in the code requirement seems analogous to  
>demanding that a particular college or university lower its entrance  
>requirements in order to allow people with less than sufficient high school  
>grades and/or SAT scores to enter.

It isn't the same thing. A ham license is not a college degree.  
My point is, and has been, that the CW requirements do not help  
us attain the chartered goals of the amateur radio service. Keep  
in mind, Amateur Radio is a service, offering privileges in  
exchange for a service.

>Ham radio is a privilege that is earned - it is not a right. This is how I  
>feel, regardless of the fact that I am denied access to parts of the spectrum  
>that I enjoyed as a General in the 60's.

Ham radio is a service chartered by the FCC with a number of goals.  
Among these goals is furthering the state of the radio art. How does  
requiring higher speed CW accomplish this? The state of the radio art  
is about more communications in less bandwidth, more reliable communications,  
better receivers, etc. Not being able to copy by ear what is easily done  
by machine. Another goal is providing a pool of trained radio operators;  
with the rapid decrease in use of CW by non-amateur services, the value of  
our "training" is increasingly questionable.

What good is ham radio if it does not achieve the chartered goals?  
How does CW help us achieve our chartered goals?

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ            | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136                | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com    DoD #466       | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: 12 Feb 93 22:39:10 GMT

From: agate!stanford.edu!CSD-NewsHost.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!  
paulf@ames.arpa  
Subject: The no-code issue  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>Ham radio is a service chartered by the FCC with a number of goals.  
>Among these goals is furthering the state of the radio art. How does  
>requiring higher speed CW accomplish this? The state of the radio art  
>is about more communications in less bandwidth, more reliable communications,  
>better receivers, etc. Not being able to copy by ear what is easily done  
>by machine. Another goal is providing a pool of trained radio operators;  
>with the rapid decrease in use of CW by non-amateur services, the value of  
>our "training" is increasingly questionable.

Actually, it's much the other way around. Amateur Radio well predates the FCC; the FCC did not "charter" the Amateur Service. Rather, the FCC recognizes that Amateur Radio has a number of beneficial byproducts, which are listed in the opening of Part 97. People become radio amateurs to have fun, not to "promote international goodwill", or "advance the state of the art" et al. Part 97 does not define amateur radio by any means.

While it is true that most other services are in the process of abandoning CW, this is not the case in practice with the amateur service; a quick scan of any of the HF bands clearly demonstrates this. This is because CW is still very well suited to amateur operation, which is done with less power and far less expense than the other services. Given that a typical CW QSO takes up less than 100Hz of bandwidth, it's also an efficient use of spectrum, a resource which again is more limited than in other services. People have been predicting the demise of CW since the days of AM rotary spark gaps; for the reasons stated above, it's not likely to happen.

A good exam design answers the question "what do we want this person to know?". All of the questions regarding the licensing structure revolve around a similar question, namely "what do we want the average ham to know?"

Well folks, what do we want the average ham to know?

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "...but I thought I was voting for 'Bill the Cat'!"  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- A Confused Voter

-----

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 93 14:33:36 GMT

From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!  
orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <VBREault.93Feb8171035@rinhp750.gmr.com>,  
<1993Feb09.154100.139420@locus.com>, <VBREault.93Feb9171105@rinhp750.gmr.com>u  
Subject : Re: Abandonment of CW

In article <VBREault.93Feb9171105@rinhp750.gmr.com> vbreault@rinhp750.gmr.com (Val Breault) writes:

>In article <1993Feb09.154100.139420@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H. Myers) writes:

>

>Dana, I look forward to your posts because I value your opinion. I have  
>learned a lot from you. However, there's either been a misunderstanding  
>here or we differ on an issue. Please allow me to restate my views.

Why, thank you. Right here I'll say we don't have much of a disagreement...

> What is all this talk about filters? Somehow people have forgotten  
> why the incentive licensing system was developed. The point was not  
> to exclude hams. The point was to give hams an incentive to learn more  
> material and be of greater value to the amateur service. Furthermore,  
> the idea was the amateur would be of greater service to the American  
> people.

>

>Okay, perhaps we could substitute the word "challenge" for "filter".  
>Would that change anything? I believe that folks value most those  
>things they had to work hardest to obtain. Since I believe that way,  
>it follows that I believe that the higher class licenses should be more  
>difficult to obtain than the lower class licenses. Not just difficult  
>for difficulties sake, but they ought to be able to show that they are  
>technically qualified to hold those licenses.

We agree on this. Changing "filter" to "challenge" really doesn't a thing. In fact, in my own note you'll see that I made such a substitution. The point about being "technically qualified" to hold a license is good; I would assert that passing the tests makes one technically qualified. It is self-defining... I think what you mean is that the higher levels of license should require greater technical knowledge, right?

>I know that there are some (Gary, for example) that don't believe the  
>same way as I do. That's okay. That's the stuff that keeps discussions  
>interesting.

Gary does keep things interesting. He's got the added benefit of remaining rational. John De Armond, on the other hand, is quite interesting, particularly when you've got him cornered :-)

> >FACT:

> >The high speed code requirement isn't going to go away any time soon.

>

> Why is this a fact? This sounds like an opinion to me.  
>  
>Dana, by using the time honored tactic of being vague, I've cleverly  
>managed to slip that one in there. However, pressed to reply, I'll say:  
>  
>I have seen NO formal mention from the FCC the ARRL or any other body  
>that proposes to remove the high speed Morse code requirement. If I've  
>missed a NPRM regarding that then please set me straight. If one were  
>to appear in tomorrows mail it would still be more than a year before  
>the requirement went away..... still not "any time soon."

Of course, the stage has been set by the revision of the Technician license. Certainly, one point does not a trend make. However, the FCC has appeared to become favorable to the notion of replacing the CW requirement; in the case of the Technician license, the FCC replaced the CW requirement with lost privileges.

> >OPINION:  
> >In light of that fact, I believe that anyone that is waiting for  
> >the requirements to change before proceeding with an upgrade is  
> >either wasting time, rattling sabers or isn't really all that  
> >interested in upgrading.  
>  
> Possibly the upgraded privileges aren't worth the effort involved  
> for some people?  
>  
>Why do you think they could not be grouped in that third class?  
>("[not] all that interested in upgrading")

I personally think incentive licensing has been proven to be flawed. The incentive is there for the minority to upgrade. The majority probably do not care.

> >When you've gotten your Extra Class license and have nothing to  
> >gain by removal of the high speed CW requirement, then you can join  
> >us in our campaign to remove it. Somehow it sounds classier coming  
> >from an Extra than from a Technician. :-) :-)  
>  
>Lookie here. Did you see that? I said it again. "... the high speed  
>CW requirement, ... join us ... to remove it."

I know, I know. However, you raised a number of points that just screamed for a response, particularly since they are favorites of the "Pro-Code" crowd :-).

>P.S. Dana, if you happen to see Rich N6LRT (used to work there)  
>tell him that Val from SHARE says "HI".

Rich? N-6-Lacy-Red-Teddy? Yup. I see him once and again in the elevator here; he's working for another of the tenants in the building...

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Fri, 12 Feb 1993 11:23:22 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!caen!sdd.hp.com!ncr-sd!ncrcae!ncrhub2!  
ncrgw2!psinntp!loretta!hbe@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Feb09.154548.139533@locus.com>,  
<2B782F0C.24594@news.service.uci.edu>, <1latnuINNibg@freedom.genrad.com>tta  
Subject : Re: What prevents someone from having 2 amateur licenses?

In article <1latnuINNibg@freedom.genrad.com> dls@freedom.genrad.com (Diana L. Carlson) writes:

>

>>>> call kb6qmu  
>>Call-Sign: KB6QMU Class: NOVICE  
>>Real Name: LUCIA X SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927  
>>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285  
>>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA  
>>Valid From: APR 14, 1987 To: APR 14, 1997  
>>Records Last Processed: APR 14, 1987

>>

>>>> call kk6ch  
>>Call-Sign: KK6CH Class: ADVANCED  
>>Previously: N6PFB Class: GENERAL  
>>Real Name: LUCIA SZYMANSKI Birthday: DEC 30, 1927  
>>Mailing Address: 6617 WOFFORD BLVD RT BOX 17, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA 93285  
>>Station Address: 6617 WOFFORD HEIGHTS BLVD, WOFFORD HEIGHTS, CA  
>>Valid From: NOV 14, 1989 To: NOV 14, 1999  
>>Records Last Processed: NOV 14, 1989

>

>

>I must have missed the point. What does this prove? Only that Lucia  
>UPGRADED from Novice to Advanced class within 1 1/2 years. Good for her!

Ahem, Diana: this is not unambiguous; they could be twins. :-)

-Harris KB6OWB

-----  
Date: 12 Feb 93 18:10:59 GMT  
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!copper!mercury.cair.du.edu!  
mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Pine.3.04.9302021726.A21654-b100000@pennsy.med.jhu.edu>,  
<C1vJv5.Arp@unccsun.uncc.edu>, <6751.2b7a8a99@hayes.com>nard  
Subject : Re: How can a WA4xxx call belong to a novice?

In article <6751.2b7a8a99@hayes.com> bcoleman@hayes.com (Bill Coleman) writes:  
>> In late 1977 and early 1978, the FCC allowed you to request any previously  
>> held callsign as long as it was not held by someone else within the last  
>> year (renewal grace period).  
>I think this program was limited to Extra class operators, no?

No, you're thinking of the custom 1x2 call program (which is where mine  
came from). I was licensed as WN5ENR in 1971; I put in for WB5ENR  
(thinking that was how it worked) in early 1977, and was told that if I  
wanted my old call, it'd be WN5ENR that I got. I decided that I didn't  
want a WN call, and got this one instead.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.  
"begin 666 foo B22!C86XG="!B96QI979E('E0=2!D96-09&5D('1H:7,A"@ ` end"  
-- David Charlap

-----  
Date: Mon, 8 Feb 1993 13:38:26 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo!sugar!  
jreese@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <p2fs3xa@dixie.com>, <1kn8qcINNes0@tamsun.tamu.edu>,  
<4jmswaa@dixie.com>neo  
Subject : Re: all of this closed repeater stuff

In article <4jmswaa@dixie.com> jgd@dixie.com (John De Armond) writes:  
>Of course, no one around here runs a commercial common  
>carrier service that tries to masquerade as an amateur "cactus net".  
>I guess that is the fundamental difference between your group and ours, eh?

I've just about had enough of this.

I'll tell YOU what John-- You don't have the foggiest notion about how these radio systems are REALLY run. Until you do, I'd suggest you close the "mouth of the south".

You haven't seen any of the Armadillo or Cactus management bashing the open systems in Atlanta...so just lay off, OK?

It's one thing to have an intelligent discussion about the differences of opinion about open vs. closed radios, no code, or any other controversial facet of Ham Radio, but every post I've seen you make on this subject has been a PERSONAL ATTACK on someone.

If you don't like it, fine...but the personal attacks only serve to weaken your position.

Enough said.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT	"If it glows...
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com	It goes!"

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #38

\*\*\*\*\*